

~~SECRET~~

5. General

54

6th January, 1960.

COCOM Document 3714.60/3

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

ITEM 1460 - AIRCRAFT

18th December 1959, and 5th January 1960

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.1, 3714.00/1, 3714.60/1 and 2 and W.P. 1460/1 - 4.

1. A Group of Experts consisting of representatives from France, the United Kingdom and the United States met on the 18th December, to discuss the United States proposal set out in paragraph 1 of COCOM Doc. No. 3714.60/2. They reported to the Committee as follows: they had been able to reach agreement as regards the two recommendations which would accompany the administrative exceptions Note proposed for part (b) by the United States Delegation. The agreed text read as follows:

"In addition, it is recommended:

1. That, in order to assure that consistent up-to-date practice obtain under the above Note, the Committee agrees that countries wishing to export engines equivalent to the "standard engines" as described in the above Note to Item 1460, will collaborate in the progressive establishment, in an Interpretative Note, of a List of such engines. Before authorising the export of any such "equivalent" engine not already on the List, Governments will submit to the Committee a full description of the "standard engine" involved and of the "equivalent" engine (or engines) with a justification as to why the Government considers it to be "equivalent".
2. That, recognising that there may be some need to embargo certain types of piston engines, Governments will consider sympathetically any proposals to embargo such specific piston type engines under the above Note as further examination of the problem may warrant."

As to the administrative exceptions Note itself, the Group of Experts agreed to recommend that the Committee adopt a text along the lines of the one suggested by the United States Delegation, with such editorial or other amendments as might be agreed.

2. The COMMITTEE then proceeded to examine the text of the administrative exceptions Note proposed by the United States Delegation, and set out below:

"Aero-engines.

(NOTE: Governments may as administrative exceptions approve for use in civilian aircraft in the Bloc reasonable numbers of (1) aero-engines of turbo-prop, turbo-shaft and turbo-jet types and series (excluding military configurations) which are the standard engines of aircraft excepted from embargo under (a)(1) and (a)(2) in this definition or are equivalent to the standard engines of such aircraft in basic characteristics, performance and technology and are useable thereon

~~SECRET~~

(See Interpretative Note ) and (2) piston type engines. As used in the Note the term "standard engines" refers to the engine or engines which have been specified by the aircraft manufacturer for the aircraft and which have been normally or frequently used thereon. (Exports authorised by Governments as administrative exceptions under this procedure should be reported to the Committee in the monthly statistical returns.)"

On the basis of a United Kingdom suggestion to delete the words "(excluding military configurations)", the UNITED STATES Delegation proposed ad referendum, and the FRENCH and UNITED KINGDOM Delegations agreed with certain reservations, to revise the wording between parentheses as follows: "(excluding military configurations differing significantly from non-military configurations)". The French Delegation's acceptance was dependent upon a satisfactory French equivalent being found for the word "configurations". If after consultation the United States authorities were unable to confirm the qualification "differing significantly from non-military configurations", the United Kingdom Delegation would want the above wording to apply only in the case of "equivalent" and not "standard" engines - a view which was shared by the French Delegation. The United States Delegation, however, were not able to agree.

3. A second amendment, proposed by the UNITED KINGDOM Delegation, and supported by the FRENCH Delegation was the addition of the wording underlined in the following clause: "...or are equivalent or inferior to the standard engines of such aircraft...". The UNITED STATES Delegation appreciated the intent behind this proposal, but could not agree to wording which would automatically free all engines inferior to the best one listed, even though they might have no civil application. They felt that the Committee would have no difficulty in dealing with the individual cases brought to its notice, and thus be able to meet the specific problems for which the listing of equivalents was designed. The FRENCH and UNITED KINGDOM Delegations were ready to agree to retain the United States wording, if it was made quite clear that the United States Delegation were in agreement with the intent of the proposed United Kingdom amendment.

4. On the basis of a third United Kingdom amendment to delete the words "and are useable thereon", the UNITED STATES Delegation suggested that the phrase be changed to read: "and which could be used thereon". The FRENCH Delegation agreed to this suggestion and the UNITED KINGDOM Delegation undertook to report it to their Government.

5. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation explained that their agreement as regards this item was conditional upon agreement being reached in the Committee for corresponding changes in Item 10(a) on the Munitions List.

6. The GERMAN Delegation undertook to transmit the amendments suggested above to their Government, but were unable to give final views at this stage.

7. Delegations agreed to report the findings of the Group of Experts, as set out in paragraph 1 above, together with the amendments suggested during the present discussion, to their Governments.

8. On the 5th January, the UNITED KINGDOM Delegate informed the Committee, that his authorities were unable to accept the United States suggestion in paragraph 4 above.

CONCLUSION : The COMMITTEE agreed that, although the present definition of Item 1460 was unsatisfactory, it would remain unchanged for the time being. It was further agreed that the matter would be re-discussed on the 28th January, 1960.